

REMARKS

Claims 1-25 remain pending in this application for which applicant seeks reconsideration.

Allowable Claims

Claims 7-17 and 18-23 have been allowed and claims 2-6 will be allowed if claims 2-4 are placed in independent form. As applicant believes that independent claims 1 and 17 are also allowable, the allowable claims have not been placed in independent form.

Art Rejection

Claims 1, 17, 24, and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Daun-Lindburg (USP 6,667,893) in view of Davila (USP 5,903,448). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection because the combination would not have disclosed or taught a controller that uses both an AC power source and an error amplified signal to control first and second switching elements.

Claims 1 and 17 each call for a control device that alternately turns ON and OFF the first and second switching elements, which are connected to the output of the rectifying device, based on the error amplified signal and an input voltage from the AC power source.

Applicant previously argued that neither Daun-Lindburg nor Davila provides an AC power source. In response, the examiner maintains that utilizing a rectified AC power source as a DC power input is well known, as taught by Davila. In this respect, the examiner urges that it would have been obvious for Daun-Lindburg to include a rectified AC power source as the DC power input to make use of a universally available power source.

Applicant submits that the combination urged by the examiner would not have been tenable because Davila, like Daun-Lundburg, explicitly teaches using a DC power source, not an AC power source. Note that Vin 210 is a DC power source. Claims 1 and 17 each call for a control device that controls the first and second switching elements based on both the error amplified signal and an input voltage from an AC power source. Moreover, applicant submits that the reference voltage 134 and Vout applied to the op-amp 130 of Daun-Lindburg both need to be a DC voltage. Applicant thus submits that there would not have been any motivation to use an AC power source for purposes of controlling any of the switching elements of Daun-Lundburg.

Request for an Interview

Applicant requests an interview to discuss how the examiner is applying Daun-Lindberg and Davila in rejecting the claims. Note that the rejection fails to 1) identify what elements of Daun-Lindberg correspond to the claimed control device and 2) where the examiner is contemplating applying the AC voltage in Daun-Lindberg as modified by Davila.

Conclusion

Applicant submits that claims 1-25 patentably distinguish over the applied references and are in condition for allowance. Should the examiner have any issues concerning this reply or any other outstanding issues remaining in this application, applicant urges the examiner to contact the undersigned to expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

ROSSI, KIMMS & McDOWELL LLP

12 OCTOBER 2006

DATE

/Lyle Kimms/

LYLE KIMMS

REG. NO. 34,079 (RULE 34, WHERE APPLICABLE)

P.O. Box 826

ASHBURN, VA 20146-0826

703-726-6020 (PHONE)

703-726-6024 (FAX)